THE

PRIMITIVE CHURCH

(OR BAPTIST)

MAGAZINE.

No. CCLIV.—FEBRUARY 1, 1865.

Essays, Expositions, &c.

IS IT HONEST!

The power of Christ's truth must never be estimated from creeds or men's profession, but from the degree in which it assimilates men to the moral character of him from whom it emanates. Just in proportion as it pervades our whole nature, purifying the spring of thought and the fountain of our emotion, and regulating our daily life, is it manifest that we are living its sanctifying and elevating power. Measured by any other standard, is only an imposition of the most disastrous kind. The principle is changeless. "By their fruits you shall know them." "Show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works."

The holy tendency of Christ's truth cannot be doubted. The great end of His wondrous mission was to enthrone it in the hearts of his people. To bring "into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." To make them not only free from the consequences of sin, but from its power and pollution. By His death he accomplished the former, for he took away sin, *i.e.* the penal consequence of sin, by the sacrifice of himself; the latter is effected by the living power of the Divine Spirit, through the medium of the truth. No higher testimony can be given to God's hatred to sin than the gift of his Son, that the Holiest should be made a sin offering—that the Happiest should gauge the lowest depths of moral wretchedness; and no moral purity can be realised by the guilty but from faith in these great verities as applied by the Holy One to men's hearts. He is the sanctifier; the only purifier of our nature.

The life of a Christian should be a standing illustration of this. It should ever reflect the moral purity of the gospel. The fruits of the Spirit in all their variety, their fulness, and harmony, should adorn our character. Holiness should pervade our nature, not occasionally, but at all times—not as an accident, but as an element of life. Transformation into Christ's image is the great end of our calling. To be like Him, in feeling, in desire, in word, and action, is our glory and our joy. Conscience should be like a finely-polished mirror, which reflects the smallest particle of dust which may repose on its surface; or like the magnet, which, by its variation, indicates the presence of some power which then diverts it from the north. Most of our readers will allow all this, yet there are in many cases violations, frequent and manifest, of the common principles of the gospel. Actions, though wrong, yet sometimes, from their frequency, do not affect the mind as they ought. Example is always powerful.

It acts upon us when we are least conscious of its presence, and not unfrequently leads us astray. Instances of this might be multiplied; not in commercial and social life only, but in the higher life of the Christian do we trace it. Integrity, honesty, and the kindred virtues are often violated. They are violated without a blush, and by individuals whose social position, intelligence, and piety, would lead us to expect better things. Permit me to indicate in this paper a few, not uncommon in our religious communion, and practised, unhappily, by some of our religious teachers.

Every one knows with what strong expressions the conduct of the Episcopal clergy has been visited for obtaining lithographed sermons in the form of MS., the productions of other men, and using them as their own in their pulpit ministrations. The secular press has held it up to the scorn and contempt of the community, as a practice which ought not to be tolerated. Nor have we forgotten with what glee Nonconformist editors have ridiculed the claims of these men, as successors of the apostles and exponents of Christ's will, who are either so indolent or so ignorant as to be dependent on other pens for the discharge of the most important duties of clerical life. We have not unfrequently laughed at the delight with which advertisements of these articles have been spread out before their readers. But we think it would not be difficult to urge a plea for them. Certainly one, if not satisfactory to the general public, would to some extent disarm the criticism of evangelicals of much of its severity. With thousands of the clergy the church is entered as the means of securing an easy and very respectable social position. It is a living. These men are not converted. They know nothing of the saving power of Christ's truth, and feel not the responsibilities of the ministry. To get through their work, and to gather as large an amount of pecuniary support from the "living," as it can be made to yield, is the great end of clerical life. Aids, of the kind of which we are writing, are hailed by them, and, in many cases we know, truths are proclaimed, which otherwise would not be heard within the walls of the church. The writer, on one occasion, listened to a magnificent sermon, at a visitation, partly from Saurin and partly from Hall. Probably such truths had not been heard before in the venerable structure.

But let us be just. Are these the only parties who addict themselves to this practice? And could the same plea be put in for them? Only one answer could be given to these enquiries. It is not how far Christian men, engaged in secular life, may avail themselves of all aids in their occasional ministrations; but how far men, professedly called by Christ and devoted to the public ministry, *can honestly* indulge in these practices. It is difficult to say what is original in any composition. Unconsciously, many thoughts are derived from reading and conversation with others. Sermons are often suggestive of an outline of thought, the use of which is perfectly legitimate. Nor should we very severely censure the taking of brilliant quotations or striking figures from the pages of others, but acknowledgment in this case would be more dignified and high principled. But the practice exists of preaching the sermons of others verbatim. The pulpit, both English, Scottish, and American, the homilists and volumes of popular sermons from both worlds, are all in great requisition. I have heard Christian men receive the plaudits of others for their excellent sermons, who had not the manliness to say, as Mr. Hall is reported to have said on one occasion when complimented for his sermon on "No Temple in Heaven"—"You will find it all in J. Howe, sir." Now, is it honest? Honest? to leave the impression on the minds of a congregation that what they have heard is, in the common acceptance of the phrase, the product of the man's own brain, when he knows it is that of another! Honest? to gain a reputation by acts of purloining another man's property, and appearing in a dress not your own! I affirm nothing in this matter! I pass no judgment on this, I fear, growing course. I merely suggest the doubt, and ask the question, Is THIS HONEST?

In the olden times, when creeds were popular, and greater importance was given to religious dogmas than now, many of the churches, for the better

security of an orthodox ministry, and to conserve the truth, had the articles of their faith embodied in their trust deeds. In some cases the stringency was very severe. The use of the property, the occupancy of the pulpit, depended on the degree of firmness with which these verities were held and proclaimed. The writer has inspected some deeds, where the surrender of a single article, not only disqualified for office, but for membership in the church. This practice was not confined to one section of the Baptist body, or to it at all. Most Nonconformists acted on it. The Arminian confession was as firmly and as conscientiously held as the Calvinian. The advocates of the former were as anxious to preserve what they believed to be the truths of God, as their brethren at the opposite poles. They embalmed them, as they thought, in their trust, and girded them with invincible security. They never dreamed of change. The thought that these sacred bonds would ever be violated, or that the sanctuaries they had raised would be used for other purposes, never entered their mind. Their sense of moral right and wrong forbade this. I only indicate these facts. On the fitness of this conduct I give no opinion. My design does not require it, or I would put it on record without hesitancy.

Now let me suppose a case. It may be a General or Particular chapel. The deeds embody a creed. The property is held in trust for its propagation. With the distinct understanding on this point, it is held by the present occupants. Now, is it honest for a minister, differing widely in theological opinion from the trust, to hold the pulpit for the propagation of views of religious truths the opposite of these? or the people to allow it? I merely put the question. I know it may be said, or it is frequently said, the church is free. Religious thought must not be fettered. Our forefathers had no right to impose a creed upon us. So far for the people. For ministers it may be urged, They must teach God's truth. Whatever they believe the mind of God to be, they are under the most sacred, nay, untransferable obligation to make it known. Both pleas may be admitted. No abatement of an atom need be demanded. But do they touch the question? No one doubts the perfect right of an individual to do what he likes with his own. But if he accepts a trust, he foregoes that. His power is limited. He has yielded assent to certain conditions. The clergy swear assent and consent to Articles, and the teaching and formularies of the Common Prayer, and we reprobate them as men violating their conscience, and unworthy of public confidence, if they utter doctrine contrary to these. Is there any difference in principle between their case and the one supposed? If the one is dishonest, we only ask how far is the other honest?

The ecclesiastical platform of our churches differs. Important distinctions exist in their constitution. In some, the membership of the church is open. Christian men of every shade of religious opinion may enter. All may be Pædobaptists. There is nothing in the constitution to prevent such a result. The pastor must be a Baptist. It is so by deed, and intended by the founder of these societies that it should be so through all generations. Others think that Christians who have not been immersed on a profession of faith in the name of the Lord, are not fit for members of the church. To the table of the Lord, men of all possible shades of religious thought, though in the main orthodox, may come, but into the church they may not enter. They are fit for the greater, but not for the privilege of listening to the quarrels and bickerings which too frequently mark these gatherings of devout men at times. The last is in contrast to both. None but baptised believers are allowed to sit down at the table or enter the church. It is not the design of this paper to discuss the reason of this wide difference. The liberty of brethren, to carry out their convictions of what they think the mind of Christ is, will not be questioned. In these matters we deplore their decisions, but we do not doubt their sincerity or their obligation to promulgate their own views. To their own Master we must leave them. We refer to these with another view. We put the case so. Suppose, in the former instance, that the majority of the members become

Pædobaptists, and, ignoring the rights of the minority, should choose an Independent to the pastorate, as one holding views more in harmony with their own than the other? Or that an individual elected to the pastorate of a church which excluded from its membership men whom it acknowledged as Christians, and admitted to communion, should seek to alter its constitution; or, in the third case, in the ardour of his zeal, throw open either the table or both. Would the most liberal of us justify the former? Would not an outcry, loud and long, be uttered against such a course as violating a solemn *trust*, and betraying an insensibility to the principles of common honesty? And is there any essential difference in either case? We may deplore the trust! We may attach such importance to our views of Christian truth, and our opinion on ecclesiastical matters, as to justify us in separating from a community of acknowledged Christians, and, in the spirit of self-denial and self-sacrifice, risk much in attempting to establish one in harmony with our own. There would be something manly, honest, and Christian in this! But to enter on a change, with the full knowledge of the constitution—to gain an influence, simply from the new relation into which we have entered, and which in other circumstances we could never have had, and then to wield it to violate a trust and break up the constitution, is a course of conduct which in worldly matters we should know how to characterise, but which in relation to professed Christian men we shall content ourselves by asking a simple question—"*Is it honest?*"

The Church of Christ is a society of professed believers in him. It is composed of saints—the "holy ones." None but such compose its membership, can enjoy its privileges, or discharge the obligations which necessarily spring from the union. In describing it, the inspired writers use terms borrowed from human relationship of the most tender and suggestive kind. There is nothing within the compass of our thought or observation so full of social endearment as the family circle; nothing which gives a more striking view of oneness, unity, the mutual dependence of one member on another, and the inferior or subordinate to the head, than the human frame. The Church is a family—a holy brotherhood—members of the Saviour's body, of his flesh and of his bones. We are members one of another. Surely there is included in all these all that is endearing, united, affectionate, and yet dependence the most entire and changeless.

The design of such an institution, the great end to be realised by the members of such a union, must not only be in harmony with its very nature, but in every way worthy of its exalted founder and head. None can doubt this. First and chiefest the glory of God. "To make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now, unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Eph. iii. 9—11.) "That ye should show forth the praises (virtue, excellence) of Him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." Subordinate and inseparable from this, is the purity and happiness of Christ's people in this world, and ultimately their full restoration to all the perfections of which their nature is capable in the home of their Father. Nor is this all. The Church is the only instrument for the conversion of the world. By no other means does the Saviour accomplish his vast and glorious design. He will subordinate all other agency, and overrule all other events, for the accomplishment of His own purpose, but it is by the Church that he will overthrow all evil, and fill the world with the light and knowledge of his glory.

It is admitted by all competent to express an opinion, that union with the Church of Christ is the highest honour which God can confer upon us. It brings the individual into the closest relationship to God—opens to him the privileges inseparable from sonship, secures to him protection from danger,

and trains him for the highest and most perfect enjoyment of which his nature is capable beyond the present. But dignity is not all. You can never separate it from responsibility. It is as true in morals as in social life, that the one, of necessity, results from the other. Every member, simply because he is a Christian, is bound in every way to advance the interests of the Church, to seek its purity, to promote its spirituality, and to labour for its increase. These must be the great end of life. Without them, it is a blank, nay, a delusion, a fraud, a crime!

Now what is true of the Church as one, is equally true of union with the individual. I enter it, because I think it is the closest approximation to the New Testament model. In doing so, I make a part of the whole. Its joys and its sorrows, its success and its trials, its privileges and its prospects, are mine; mine in a fulness which places me on an equality with any other. To aid it is my duty; to do anything which would retard its prosperity or weaken its influence, would be a crime. My obligations to do this are untransferable. I am bound to aim at this, to seek it with as much prayerful earnestness and effort as though all depended on me. For others I am not responsible. Only for my own use of talents will the Judge demand an account of me. But though all this is admitted, there are multitudes, perhaps unconsciously, or thoughtlessly, we will not say knowingly and deliberately, violate these obligations. For example, there are many in our churches who throw all pecuniary responsibility on a few. They will pray, but to give of their prosperity is out of the question. To them, the gospel is emphatically free. They will occupy a pew—participate in the labour and teaching of a pastor, and from year to year scarcely render the smallest pecuniary aid to the support of Christ's cause. They will gratify their appetites. They will consume more on tobacco and drink in a month than they give to the work of God in a year. What shall we say to such things! Shall we characterise them as we ought! We will not be severe, only we ask such men, if any read this article, Would worldly men call it *honest?*

In many churches there is uncommon laxity in their pecuniary dealings with ministers. An income of a certain amount is promised. Upon this understanding the pastorate is entered. With zeal the man of God enters on his work, with the fullest confidence in the integrity of his people. Every moral principle warrants this. The world ordinarily acts on it, and doubt cannot exist in relation to the Church of Christ! But what is the fact? I have known many instances in which these engagements have been broken. The minister has suffered; salary has been unpaid; and his reputation has been in jeopardy from the neglect of men in office. From such a course they would shrink in their transactions in business, or in dealing with their workmen. Society would stamp their character aright in these cases. But, surely, principles do not change with circumstances! What would be reprobated by the world, cannot be approved by men who profess to be governed by loftier principles. If withholding the hire from the labourer calls to heaven for vengeance, can the suffering of the Christian pastor, from the withholding of his salary—in many cases from the indifference of men in office—be less offensive to infinite holiness because it is done under the mask of the religion of Christ! Can it? *Is it honest?*

Another class, quite as numerous, and whose influence touches the Church of God in various ways. Some of them are frequently absent from the sanctuary on the Sabbath. They are the light elements of the Church. Every new thing attracts. Running to and fro from place to place, they neglect their own pastor, and violate the solemn obligations into which they entered in uniting with the Christian brotherhood. In others, the social meetings of the Church are neglected. The week evening assemblings of the brethren are never attended. Their voice of prayer and praise is never heard. Business presses. They cannot leave it for an hour. And yet, if other matters, purely worldly, present their claims, time then is of no moment, and

business can be given up. These are only mentioned as samples of a class. The tendency of such a course cannot be mistaken. All act in this way—and if one professing disciple is justified in doing so, why not all?—and the Church of Christ would be a sham, a shadow without substance, a body without a soul. Of the influence of such members on the Church at large, of its paralysing effect on the pastor, of its mischief to the family of the individual, and the encouragement it affords to the world, are so manifest to the thoughtful mind, that we need not stay to unfold it. We would not say such persons are not Christians, but we do not envy their position, because no one can doubt the answer which must be given to this question, "Is it honest?"

How far these, and kindred evils, contribute to the feebleness of spiritual life and the little success of our churches in the present time, is an enquiry of the very highest importance. It demands the prayerful attention of every reader. God cannot bless wrong. Hypocrisy cannot be approved. Holy hands must be lifted up before Him. Holiness becometh His house. Integrity, sincerity, and truthfulness, are the common elements of a manly, virtuous character; how much more should they be unfolded in their fulness and harmony in all who love the Saviour in sincerity and truth. Then should we be "lights of the world," "the salt of the earth," and God, even our own God, would delight to help us.

Scarborough.

SACRIFICE.—ITS GENERAL DESIGN.

WE have endeavoured to prove that all acceptable sacrifice must be divinely appointed; let us now endeavour to ascertain the divine design in the appointment of sin-offering in general. And,

1. It appears to have been instituted as a meeting point and medium of intercourse between a holy God and fallen man. In proof of this we might adduce the whole history of sacrifice as recorded in Scripture. Even the first sacrifice there recorded suggests the idea. Cain and Abel (Gen. iv. 3—10) brought each their offering "*unto the Lord.*" God met them in the presentation. He found Cain's sacrifice outward and shadowy; Abel's inward, and substantial as well. He accepted the one, and rejected the other. He even condescended to reason with Cain, and show him why his offering was not accepted. Cain did "not well." Sin lay at "the *door.*" He had not yet learned the first principle of divine truth. His hopes did not rest on the great promise, nor was his conscience purified by faith in it. We are not sure that he brought any subsequent offering. But the narrative seems almost to suggest (ver. 9) that he did. After the murder he might wish to be on friendly terms with his Maker. Possibly this time, he may have brought a bloody sacrifice. But this time he would have to worship alone, at least without his quondam fellow-worshipper. Under such circumstances, nothing could be more natural than the question, "Where is Abel thy brother?" 'You came *together* before, and now he is *absent*. What has become of him? The last time you were here, you went away wroth with your brother; have you become reconciled to him since?'

But, that sacrifice was intended to be a meeting point between God and his people is more fully proved by the subsequent history. To approach God's *altar* was to draw near to *him*. Thus David says, "I will go to the altar of God, *unto God*, my exceeding joy." When the sin-offering was brought to the altar, the hands of the offerer were laid on its head (Lev. viii. 14), so that, *over* the sacrifice were the hands of the offerer, and *under* it was God's altar—the sacrifice was the meeting point and medium of intercourse between the two parties.

Again. The Israelites were commanded to bring their offerings to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation (Lev. xvii. 8, 9, and iii. 2). The tabernacle of the congregation was God's house, and *there* was his altar. Those who

wished to meet Him, could bring their offerings there. He would not only give them a hearty welcome, but would come to His door to meet them. But those who came without sacrifice had no business at the altar—no business even at the *door of His house*. His "saints" are those who make a "covenant with Him by sacrifice."

Sacrifice, then, was appointed to be a medium of intercourse between God and man. And this medium of intercourse had special reference to the circumstances in which sin had placed humanity. When Adam approached the tree of life in the garden, it was as an innocent being. Whatever benefits God conferred upon him through means of this tree were gifts of benevolence, not of mercy. But man now needs *mercy*. He is doomed to death. The way to the tree of life is barred. His only hope now is in the promise. The "seed of the woman" has "bruised the head of the serpent." No man cometh unto the Father but by Christ. He is, and ever was, the only medium of *spiritual intercourse* between sinful man and a holy God. The legal sacrifices constituted a medium of intercourse between God and the Israelites, but not a *spiritual* one. The imposition of hands on the offering was indeed expressive of faith, but the ceremony might be used in the absence of that faith of which it was expressive. In such case the sacrifice was outward only, and could secure no spiritual blessing. Even then, however, God might, as it pleased him, bestow upon the offerer the outward blessing desired, because he respects the outward, in so far as it is a fitting means of suggesting and enforcing the inward. Thus we often meet with the clause "And it shall be forgiven him," after the instructions in the law respecting sin-offerings, supposing these instructions to be observed. The promised forgiveness must have *invariably* followed the atonement; but the forgiveness would be more comprehensive in some cases than in others. In case the sacrifice was outward merely, involving no spiritual faith, there could be no spiritual intercourse, no purification of the conscience, no atonement comprehending the unseen and eternal. If, however, the sacrifice were offered in the exercise of faith, *that* faith, terminating, not on the animal presented, but on the Great Sacrifice alluded to in the promise, secured advantages reaching beyond the time then present, and embracing the boundless future in the world to come; so that Jesus, the Lamb of God, is, and always was, the exclusive medium of *spiritual* intercourse between sinful man and a holy God.

2. Another object in the institution of sacrifice seems to have been to keep before the minds of those who were being redeemed the means of their deliverance. The promise of a Deliverer was made to Adam before his expulsion from Paradise. This promise is the fountain-head of the history of Redemption. Sacrifice took its rise at the same fountain-head, and the two streams run parallel throughout. The subject of the promise is the great object of godly faith, for in that promise is wrapt up the whole mystery of Redemption. It was *faith in the promise* that prompted to acceptable offering, and that made Abel's offering a "fuller sacrifice" than Cain's. Had Cain brought a bloody sacrifice without this kernel of faith, Abel's would still have been "fuller." Though sacrifice gave form and expression to faith, a faithless sacrifice was but a lifeless corpse. From such a sacrifice but little good was to be expected. But the offerer of faith-filled sacrifice was never far from deliverance. Indeed, both in the original promise itself, and in the whole of its subsequent development, God-appointed and God-accepted sacrifice is connected with deliverance as means and end. By means of it, Abel "obtained witness that he was righteous." By means of it, Noah obtained deliverance from all apprehension that his posterity would be swept away by a universal deluge. By means of it, the children of Israel were preserved from the destruction of the first-born. By means of it, the land was cleansed from the guilt of innocent blood when a murder had been committed and the murderer could not be found.

Man stands in need of a great deliverance—an inward and spiritual deliverance. But he is also exposed to outward and temporal evils, which are but

shadows of the great evil of sin and its consequences. In removing these outward evils by shadowy sacrifices, God kept before the minds of his people of old the great evil to be deprecated and the great sacrifice to be offered. The law had a "shadow of good things to come." If the question is asked, Why are not these symbols continued in the church? the answer is, that the continuance of shadowy sacrifices after THE sacrifice has been offered, would be a reflection on that sacrifice. There would be a remembrance again made of sins, as if the Great Sacrifice was insufficient. Every new sin-offering implies insufficiency in all preceding ones. Christ was the first, the only sacrificial victim which rose again from the dead, and his resurrection is decisive proof of the sufficiency of his sacrifice, and *ipso facto* abolishes sin-offering for ever. If it be thought that we still need, after the death of Christ, some outward sign to remind us of the means of our deliverance, it may be as well to remark that the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper are appointed for this express purpose, the latter reminding us of the body broken and the blood shed for us, and the former of the two great pillars which support the Christian edifice—the death and resurrection of our Lord. Neither of these ordinances can be in any sense a sacrifice for sin, for Christ has by one offering perfected for ever them that are sanctified. *Neither* can be a *direct* means of salvation, for the only *direct* means of salvation is He who declares himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life. The only value of these ordinances arises from their connection with the truth as it is in Jesus, and the tendency they have to insinuate that truth into the mind and strengthen our hold upon it. What these ordinances are to us, the legal sacrifices were to the Jews of old—mementos of the way of salvation.

3. Another end for which sacrifice was instituted was to make reconciliation for uncleanness. An illustration which has just served our purpose under the former head may again serve us under this. It is laid down in the Levitical law (Num. xxxv. 31—33) that no satisfaction should be taken for the life of a murderer; for that "blood defileth the land, and the land cannot be *cleansed* of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." This implies that putting the murderer to death would cleanse the land, and this the people are in the first instance recommended to do. But in what sense could the blood of a murderer cleanse a land? Only in the sense of *averting from the people the guilt of innocent blood.* Until they had done all that could be done to discover the murderer, they were liable to be considered as sharing in his crime. If they discovered the murderer and put him to death, the land was *cleansed.* That is—their liability was at an end. To suppose that the word *cleansed* here means a *reformation of manners*, would be to murder the text. We do not say that such a meaning has been suggested, but the argument of those who deny propitiation in the proper sense of the term requires that some such meaning be affixed to it.

If the murderer could not be found, a heifer was to be sacrificed (Deut. xxi. 1—8) by the elders of the nearest city, under the most solemn protestations of innocence, and so the land was to be cleansed—thus the guilt of innocent blood did not fall upon the people. "The blood shall be forgiven them." (Ver. 8.)

Now why was this sacrifice instituted? Why were not a diligent search and a solemn protestation of innocence enough, without a sacrifice, to release the people from their liability? One reason for the institution of this particular sacrifice must have been to keep before the minds of the people the means by which God grants deliverance to his sinful creatures: "Without shedding of blood is no remission." In this case, not only was remission through shedding of blood, but it could not possibly be obtained in any other way. But what was this remission? Reformation of manners? Certainly not, but freedom from participation in the murderer's crime, and so in the murderer's doom; in other words, *freedom from penal liability.*

It is worthy of reflection, that as the shedding of blood was the penalty, so it

is blood that is appointed to make reconciliation. If it be said that the blood of a heifer was a poor substitute for the blood of a murderer, we reply, so it would have been; but it was not appointed to be an expiation so far forth as the *murderer* was concerned, but only so far forth as *the land and its inhabitants* were concerned. "The blood (it is said) shall be forgiven *them*." They were held responsible till the land was cleansed, and that could not be done without the shedding of blood. If we find not here the doctrine of substitutionary expiation, at least we find something that bears a marked resemblance to it. And if we find a *picture* of expiation in the Old Testament, we shall find the *thing itself* in the New.

It is remarkable too, that the expiations made for ceremonial uncleannesses, were made on the *cessation* of the uncleanness, and not whilst the persons were in *a state of uncleanness*. Thus (Lev. xv. 13—15): "And when he that hath an issue *is cleansed* of his issue, then he shall number to himself seven days for his cleansing, and wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in running water, and *shall be clean*. And on the *eighth day* he shall take to him two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, and come before the Lord unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and give them unto the priest. And the priest shall offer them, the one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering: and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord for his issue." This passage, which is only one of a class speaking the same language, is suggestive of more than one train of thought, but we adduce it here to show that a cessation of uncleanness did not obviate the necessity for an atonement on behalf of those who had been unclean; in other words, that the necessity for a sacrifice was not primarily a *moral* but a *legal* one.

The words "and it shall be forgiven him," coming, as they do, like a refrain at the end of every minute prescription in regard to sin-offering, show demonstrably, that the forgiveness was granted in consideration of the sacrifice, and this should teach us that the full remission bestowed on believers in Christ, is only granted in consideration of the Christian sacrifice. It has indeed been said that "Jesus, as the sin-offering, is offered *by* and not *to* God," but if any argument has ever been advanced on purpose to support the assertion, it has escaped our observation. We know of nothing that has been or can be said in support of it. On the contrary, we think there is much that bears in a quite contrary direction. Indeed, there is not to be found the mention of a single sin-offering offered by God to man in the whole of the Old Testament, so that, if Christ, as the sin-offering, was offered *by* God, and not *to* God, then, there is not a clear type, nor a correct outline, nor a full-formed shadow of the manner of our salvation in the whole Bible.

Besides, what meant the reconciling of the holy place, and the sprinkling with blood of the altar and the mercy-seat? What uncleanness could attach to them? Only such as was communicated to them by the people. When "purged with blood," they were "hallowed from the uncleanness of the children of Israel" (Lev. xvi. 19), who sometimes by their uncleanness "defiled the tabernacle that was among them." (Lev. xv. 31.) The touch of a polluted person communicated pollution even to *things* and *places*. This pollution of things and places, with their subsequent cleansing, is very significant. It mattered not for the thing polluted that the person communicating the pollution was cleansed—the cleansing of the person did not suffice for the cleansing of the polluted object. The object must itself be cleansed. And why? Why but, because reformation of manners is not sufficient in the eyes of Infinite Purity to entitle to acceptance. Hence every contaminated object had to be cleansed with blood. The blood must appear even on the horns of the golden altar. Hence Jesus also presents his blood in the holiest of all, appearing as a "slain lamb" "in the presence of God for us"—as if to say, no entrance into heaven for those who have once sinned but by the blood of a Divinely accepted expiation—as if to say, the entrance even of the *sanctified* within the holiest of all would pollute the place, but for the blood carried thither and presented there by the

Great High Priest of our profession.

Another illustration under this head may be taken from the ceremonies performed on the day of annual atonement. The congregation was to furnish two kids of the goats for a sin-offering. (Lev. xvi. 5.) These constituted not two sin-offerings, but *one* sin-offering. They were *two* only as *goats*. Both were presented before the Lord (ver. 7), both were destined to *make atonement* (ver. 10 and 16), but in different ways. One was to be slain, and its blood to be sprinkled on the mercy-seat and the altar; afterwards, the other, having all the transgressions of the people in all their sins confessed over and heaped on its head, was to be let go into the wilderness, that there the whole mass of pollution might be out of sight and lost. These ceremonies taken together represent the means of our salvation. The points of resemblance are different, but they all meet in the person of the Saviour. He is a Lamb without blemish and without spot. As such He died, rose again, and ascended up to the right hand of God. As the "slain lamb," He was fitly represented by the goat that was for the Lord. But the goat which bore all the transgressions of the people represented Him also. He was "made sin for us." He "appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh." The "Lord caused to meet on Him the iniquity of us all." "He bore our sins in his own body to the tree." What a solitude was made around him there! The Jews cried "Crucify him." Pilate gave them leave. The Romans executed the sentence. The people jeered Him. The soldiers mocked Him. The disciples betrayed Him, denied Him, or deserted Him. The Father himself *forsook* Him. That this last desertion was more bitter than all the rest, is manifest from the cry, "My God, my God, why hast THOU forsaken me?" What a wilderness! By this sacrifice He put away sin, and laid aside for ever the "likeness of sinful flesh." He no more appears in that likeness. If sought for, that likeness can no more be found. It is lost for ever in the wilderness of Christ's desertion. He appears before the Throne with blood, but it is precious blood; and, having made propitiation with it in the *holiest of all*, if we confess over Him all our transgressions in all our sins, putting them on his guiltless head, He who entered for us into the wilderness, and there trod for us the winepress *alone*, will cause the burden of our sins to "loosen from our shoulders, fall from off our back, begin to tumble, and so continue to do till it comes to the mouth of the sepulchre, where it will fall in, and we shall see it no more."

THE THOUGHTS OF MEN.

BY W. JENKINS, TREHERBERT, GLAMORGANSHIRE.

It is the glory of man that he can think. If any one could be bold enough to rise up and call in question the power of man to think, the chief forces of nature would cry out against his mode of arguing, *Order, order!* and his feeble voice would soon be drowned in the *loud hisses* of creation. He that could get up to doubt man's power to think, would be considered out of *all order*. The winds and the waves, the thunder and the lightning, would consider such a man quite ready for an asylum. The discoveries of science, and the wonders of art, would soon silence such a man, and cover him in a *thick mantle of shame*. We are not going to write anything to prove that man is capable of thought. This point was settled long before we were born—yes, centuries before this generation of thinking beings ever became conscious of existence. Neither are we going to give you a correct definition of that mysterious *something* within us called *mind*. The reason why we will not do this is very plain—*we cannot*. Our philosophers do not profess anything but profound ignorance on the subject. We can only judge of matter and mind by their properties, and the different phenomena they exhibit. It is of the actions of mind that we are to treat. Thoughts are the products of mind—*not the mind itself*. Thoughts are the opinions of the mind. The mind *moves* in

thoughts—thoughts, again, are revealed in *words* and *actions*. When we speak or write about the thoughts of men, we mean their opinions—their purposes and plans.

I. THE THOUGHTS OF MEN IN RELATION TO GOD.

The psalmist makes mention of a man who thinks that *there is no God*. We cannot for a moment allow such a thought even to pass through *our* minds. He does not only *think* that there is no God, but he has said so in his heart. "Well, he must be a fool then," says every intelligent man. Yes, that is the exact character which God himself, in his Word, gives him. "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." Others, whilst they believe in the existence of God, *exclude him entirely from their minds*. What thousands of *practical* atheists we have in this land of Christian privileges! What a multitude of thoughts pass through and lodge in the hearts of the ungodly! But *God* is not in all these thoughts. Pharaoh, the cruel king of Egypt, permitted the idea of the God of Israel to enter his mind *only* when he continued to triumph over his plans; with regard to the nation, that was at the time groaning under his iron rule. Pharaoh's plans and God's purposes came into *collision* in the Red Sea. You know the consequence. God commanded the waves to settle the question with the proud king—whether Israel should be liberated or not! Look through the prophecies—see all the opposers of truth vanquished, and the New Testament Church, after such a deliverance, singing songs of joy and triumph! The thoughts of the godly concerning God are the *best* and the *safest* to *live* and *die* with. They think that their God is incomparable, and that it infinitely transcends the power of reason—yea, *the power of love*—to describe his character. All perfection meets in Him.

II. THE THOUGHTS OF MEN IN RELATION TO THE GOVERNMENT OF GOD.

According to the thoughts of some, God is no governor at all. He created everything, but he has left his creatures, they say, to rule themselves. "*The laws of nature*" can do everything. God has been described sitting, as it were, in some corner of the universe as an indifferent spectator, looking on the great machinery of nature working by its own power in proud independence. These thoughts, you know, are not founded on Scripture testimony. Could you *sever* for a moment the connection that exists between God and his mighty works in creation, what would become of the universe? God's word is the link to which worlds hang in space. Suppose, seriously, this link could be broken; what would become of these worlds afterwards? The laws of nature would keep them in their places? No, never, without the help of God. What are the laws of nature without God? I should *tremble at the idea* of God's connection in the maintenance and government of the world being brought to an end. What afterwards? Universal waste and ruin. Heaven itself would give way. Heaven, as a place, cannot uphold itself. It is God in Christ that upholdeth all things by the word of his power. God, in relation to the government of this world, appears in a twofold character, viz.—He is a natural and a moral governor. His rule is universal in nature; He also rules all intelligent beings, whether willing or not. There is also *His government through the Mediator in the Church*. Here Christ appears in all the loveliness of his character. Crowds of different thoughts cluster around this subject, viz.—*the government of God*; but we must leave them all at present, and pass on to

III. THE THOUGHTS OF MEN IN RELATION TO THEMSELVES AND CHRISTIANITY.

Some think they have no need of Christianity. The book of nature, according to them, is sufficient. We also admire the book of nature; but whoever thinks that this book is a safe guide to a *correct notion* of the character of God, let him look for a moment at the condition of those who are destitute of Revelation. Without attempting to give a description, the reader will be kind enough to glance at the following subjects and particulars concerning the thoughts of men, viz.—*Their thoughts of God, of man, of the gospel and its revelations, future state, immortality, rewards and punishments.* Volumes might be written on each.

Having merely called attention to some of the subjects upon which men have been and are meditating, let us endeavour to fill our hearts with good, holy, and God-like thoughts. Let us study the mind of Christ, drink his spirit, and embody his thoughts, on everything pertaining to our religion. We intend in our next calling the reader's attention to the *Thoughts of God*. Vain thoughts, ungodly thoughts, rebellious thoughts, depart from every heart, and let good and heavenly thoughts occupy every corner in the chambers of our souls!

OUR SAFEGUARDS AGAINST THE RETURN OF POPERY TO SUPREME CIVIL POWER.

THE Act of 1829 "for the Relief" of Roman Catholics from "certain Restraints and Disabilities to which other subjects of his Majesty [were] not liable," did not profess to put them on an EQUALITY with the most favoured of his Majesty's subjects. It retained and imposed certain Restraints and Disabilities, as the means of maintaining THE ASCENDANCY OF PROTESTANT INFLUENCE IN THE GOVERNMENT. It was based upon a conviction that there would be danger to civil and religious liberty, if no restraints existed—a conviction that such a state of things as there is still in such countries as Spain, and Austria, and the Dominions of the Pope, might be expected to return in this country, if there were not some disabilities left or enacted to guard against that return. An OATH was required to be taken, in which the Roman Catholic says, "I do solemnly swear, that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am, or may become, entitled, to disturb or weaken the PROTESTANT RELIGION or PROTESTANT GOVERNMENT in the United Kingdom." This oath implies the conviction of those who passed it, that unless Roman Catholics could be prevented from using their power, as officers of the State, to weaken either the "Protestant Religion" or the "Protestant Government," they might injure or destroy the rights and liberties of Protestants, and endeavour to conform our civil law to the despotic canons of the Church of Rome. It must be admitted that there was reason for this fear. But must it not be very difficult for a Roman Catholic who holds his faith with firmness, to take such an oath sincerely, and to keep it faithfully when taken?

Another safeguard against such a danger, was the exclusion of Roman Catholics from certain high offices—from being Guardians, or Regent of the United Kingdom, or Lord High Chancellor, or Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, or High Commissioner to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. But they may hold "ALL CIVIL AND MILITARY OFFICES AND PLACES OF TRUST or profit, under" the crown, except these. Not only members of Parliament, but the whole Privy Council, the Prime Minister, and all the Cabinet, except the Lord Chancellor; the Commander-in-Chief, the Lords of the Admiralty, all military and naval officers, the Judges, and all officers of the courts of law; MAY be Roman Catholics, if duly appointed, and if they take the oath prescribed by the Act, and abstain from interfering with the Established Churches of England, Ireland, and Scotland. They were not forbidden by the Act to ask for grants of public money for the clergy and the institutions of the Roman Catholic Church; and this permission they have diligently used.

Another restraint was the provision made by the Act, "for the GRADUAL SUPPRESSION and FINAL PROHIBITION" of all Roman Catholic societies of MEN "bound by MONASTIC and RELIGIOUS VOWS," including the Jesuits. "Every Jesuit and every member" of such societies, was to deliver to the clerk of the peace, a statement, giving his name, age, place of birth, society to which he belonged, the name and residence of the next superior in that society, and his own place of residence; and if he did not do this within six months of the commencement of the Act, he was to forfeit £50 a month for so long as he remained in the kingdom without having done so. If, after the commencement of the Act, "any Jesuit, or member of any such religious order," not born here,

should "come into this realm," he was to be deemed "guilty of a misdemeanour," and, upon conviction, "to be banished from the United Kingdom for the term of his natural life." But he might receive from some one of the chief Secretaries of State, being a Protestant, permission, in writing, to stay here for not more than six months. If "any Jesuit, or member of any such religious order," within this kingdom, should admit any person to become a member of the order, he was to be "punished by fine and imprisonment," and the person admitted was to be banished for life. WOMEN bound by monastic vows, were excepted from these rules.

A reason for passing these stringent rules is found in the calamities which almost all nations, even those in which the Roman Catholic religion has prevailed, have suffered from the amazing power and mischievous intrigues of numbers of such orders. But has the passing of the Act had the effect at which, professedly, it aimed—"THE GRADUAL SUPPRESSION AND FINAL PROHIBITION" of these orders within the United Kingdom? Let us hear the report of Cardinal Wiseman to the members of his own church in 1863. The Act was passed in 1829. He says:—"In 1830 no house of religious men existed there [in England]; in 1850 there were eleven; and their number at present amounts to fifty-three." What a startling fact! From the time of the passing of the Act which admitted the Roman Catholics to civil power, and which, in order to make the exercise of that power harmless to our national liberties, forbade the existence of such orders in England, these very orders have been founded here, and have increased with rapidity. The Roman Catholics have violated the law openly; they have promoted with energy that part of their system which we have most reason to dread; and the Government has tolerated the very evil which, when the Act was passed, it professed a resolution to prevent. Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits, and orders many, are in full action; nor is there an attempt made to conceal their existence, on the one hand, or to put a stop to it, on the other. In North Wales, says the Cardinal, "a region once most remote from Catholic influences, we now find A LARGE COLLEGE OF JESUIT FATHERS, a very picturesque convent of Capuchins," &c.

It may be that some who passed the Act of 1829 never intended that its provisions as to these orders should be carried out; nor ever expected it; that these provisions were put into it to give merely the appearance of greater safety, and win the confidence of those who were thought too scrupulous and fearful. If so, the persons who trusted to that appearance of safety, are now undeceived; and if the pages of earlier and of later history are true teachers, those who see no danger in the increase of such institutions, must be more sceptical than wise.

The safeguards, therefore, provided by the State against the danger of Roman Catholic supremacy in it, and the overthrow of our civil liberties, are, it must be owned, weak to resist the danger attendant on the increase of Roman Catholic power.

Public sentiment, and true religion—these, and these alone, can be expected, by God's blessing, to prevent the return of civil and religious despotism. Instead of apathy, there needs to be a ceaseless earnestness and energy of action to guard against this deadly evil.

WILLIAM NORTON.

OUR PROTESTANT NONCONFORMITY—WHAT IT IS, AND HOW WE CAME BY IT.

BY GEORGE WEBB, EYNSFORD, KENT.

PROTESTANTISM is not dead, but sleepeth, and Popery is taking advantage of the temporary lull in this country to regain her lost position. Perhaps this lull is not so much the result of indifference to the principles for which our forefathers bled and died, and which they handed down to us as a legacy, as it

is the consequence of the power of the Oppressor of Conscience being broken. Moreover, men do not feel so much as they did, in days gone by, the necessity of calling attention to what were considered then deadly errors which ought to be combated. Liberty of conscience has been given, and more liberty of action has grown out of it. A very great desire to live in peace with all men, has followed the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts, and the removal of other disabilities, which before pressed sorely upon that section of the Christian public called Dissenters. But, while we are thankful that these disabilities have been removed, we have a right to ask, with what reason or justice were they ever imposed? And if reason and justice cannot prove the right of imposition, then, I ask, what business have we to show gratitude for that which was manifestly our own, and ought never to have been taken from us, by allowing the Man of Sin to work, without lifting up our voice against him?

We are called Protestants. This designation was acquired by the followers of Luther (among whom, as chief, was the Elector of Saxony) in 1529, at the Diet of Spires. A civil war was imminent. Charles V. of Germany, the then greatest reigning monarch, and principal prop of the Papacy, called all the princes together, and demanded submission in religious matters to the Pope of Rome. But the true light had been too long shining to be put out by such means, and the Emperor Charles was too deeply engaged in resisting the invasion of Austria by the Turks to enforce by the sword what he could not obtain by words, and contented himself with a promise from some of the assembled princes that no more innovations should take place in religion. Against this promise many of the princes protested, and obtained the title of Protestant, which we still bear, and by which we delight to be called in England. But the readers of "The Primitive Church," I trust, are something more that protestors or Protestants. They bear a more noble title than did these German princes. We are called Protestant Dissenters, or Protestant Nonconformists, and have inherited our title from the days of Queen Elizabeth, who resolved to enforce Conformity to the State Establishment, by compelling all the clergy to wear the white surplice while they read the prayers, &c., and the black gown while they read the sermon, and enforcing also the reading of the Liturgy or Prayer Book in all the churches instead of praying, and the reading of the sermon instead of preaching extempore (or without book), as was permitted before by those who could do it, and is considered now in the Dissenting world almost a prerequisite for the ministerial office. But there were near two thousand clergy of the Establishment who would not wear the "frock," as it was called, nor read the Liturgy. These were turned out of their livings, to do as best they could. Many of them turned their attention to various pursuits of life—turned mechanics, agricultural labourers, in fact, anything to obtain an honest living, rather than have their consciences enslaved by the Act of Uniformity. At the same time, they met their former friends, and preached to them the unsearchable riches of Christ; and real, true religion was fostered by these worthies, and grew faster out of the Establishment than in it. Persecution followed, more sanguinary than under the reign of Mary—the Bloody Queen, as she was called—but the light set shining in the churches in the days of Henry VIII., by the claiming of a Bible for the use of all the people in the parish church, was not now to be extinguished. Light was given for the righteous, and truth for the upright in heart.

By the Act of Uniformity, all the best preachers and most godly ministers—men who had principles—in the Established Church, were driven out of it, and a set of hirelings, who were put in the priesthood for a morsel of bread, were let in, whose only care was to get a good fleece, and shear it as closely as possible. This must ever be the tendency of a State Church, for, under the best of Governments, it must inevitably be the tool of the State, and do the bidding of the governors; and if these governors be men of the world, as is generally the case, they will be most likely to patronise those clergymen

who allow them to possess the easiest conscience, by withholding part of the truth, and that part especially which the Holy Spirit blesses in the gathering in and building up of souls. It is thus a State Religion always is, and always will be, corrupted.

But while the State Church was so corrupt, there were the true torches holding forth the light of the gospel, and God blessed them, and others, through them, and all the attempts to subvert the truth as it is in Jesus could not prevail. Such tools of the State did the clergy become in the days of James I., that a "Book of Sports," prescribing for the people how to spend Sunday afternoon, written at the bidding of the king and the prelates, and commanded to be read in the churches by a royal mandate, was in most instances obeyed. But some of the old Puritans who were turned out in Elizabeth's reign, had, at the beginning of James's reign, regained their former position, and had reëntered to the Church Establishment (we must bear in mind, James came from Scotland, where Episcopacy never had a firm footing, and would, naturally, be inclined to favour the Puritans—hence their return from whence they had been driven); but their presence in the Church made the unprincipled clergy very uncomfortable, and the "Book of Sports" was the shaft aimed at them for their removal; and, again, these men refused to have their consciences enslaved, and about two thousand were again ejected.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

THE SUPPORT OF MISSIONARY PASTORS.

To the Editors of the Primitive Church Magazine.

GENTLEMEN, — I have read Mr. Craig's pamphlet (in reply to Dr. Carson) which was reviewed in the October number of "The Primitive Church Magazine." There is one fact brought out in that pamphlet to which I desire to call public attention, namely—the principle on which the minister at Coleraine is paid. Two of the pastors of that church, I find, had £60 per annum, viz.—£30 from the church, and £30 from the Baptist Irish Society. Their successor had £200 per annum, viz.—£100 from the church, and £100 from the Baptist Irish Society; and, I understand, the principle on which the society acts in the case of that church is to give the minister an equal sum with that contributed by the church. Permit me to say that this policy appears to me to be a very unjust one. For if it be proper to observe it in the case of Coleraine, it would be proper to observe it in the case of every other missionary church. The consequence would be that assistance would be given to a church according to its wealth, and denied according to its poverty—the more wealthy the church, the more its minister would receive from the society, and *vice versa*. It would also appear to me to have another most injurious tendency, as it would enable a church which might be dissatisfied with the honest rebukes of a faithful minister, to starve him out, and would serve as a powerful temptation to a time-serving minister to endeavour to please the rich. In many instances it would serve as a kind of bribe to a minister to spare the vices of the wealthy, whilst it would have the effect of a fine upon an uncompromising servant of God. It would appear to me to agree much better with common sense, and common honesty as well, as the *professed object of a missionary society*, to assist the weak rather than the strong, and to encourage faithfulness on the part of the minister rather than cast a stumbling block in the way. I do not say that such is actually the case at Coleraine, nor do I insinuate that such is the *intention* of the Baptist Irish Society—far from it; but such is the natural tendency of the principle.

Yours truly,

A FRIEND OF MISSIONS.

Poetry.

[ORIGINAL.]

TO A SAINT AT HOME!

THOU art gone to thy home, thy fair home in glory—
Thy spirit has reach'd the bright regions of light,
To recount in the house of thy Father the story
Of all thy home yearnings, ere faith chang'd to sight.

Thou art gone to thy home, where thy welcome was certain—
Where Jesus received thee with smile of delight;
Death came as a friend, and just lifted the curtain,
Revealing the glories, the raptures of "sight."

Thou art gone to thy home, thy home of rare beauty,
Whose glories no finite conception can trace;
Where failings and sorrows no more can distress thee—
Thy rest is complete in that heavenly place.

Cardiff. E. BRAUND.

Reviews.

The Debate in the House of Lords on the Power of Convocation, July 15th, 1864, with an Introduction, and the Judgment of the Privy Council in "Essays and Reviews." London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder, 27, Paternoster-row; and Arthur Miall, 18, Bouverie-street. Pp. 62.

THIS is an invaluable pamphlet for all who desire to understand the existing relations between the crown and the clergy of the State Church. It is brimful of important information. The union of Church and State is rapidly becoming the great question of the day. All parties are beginning to recognise its vitality. Mr. Disraeli has drawn attention to it by inscribing High Church principles on the Tory banner. The final battle between genuine liberalism and despotism will be fought out on ecclesiastical ground.

"The question is this,—Shall religious life and effort be left to their own free growth and development, according to the laws of the human mind and the principles of the gospel; or shall they be encased and confined within the wrappings and ligatures of a legal and endowed establishment? Which will most conduce to the maintenance of truth, and the diffusion of goodness, that this life—which, if genuine, is divine, and, like all other life, obeys its own inherent laws—be left to the natural action of those laws to flourish in vigorous independence, or that it be crippled by artificial and stereotyped regulations, and propped up by extraneous support, so as to promote certain secular ends that are alien to its nature?"

This is the question which now urgently demands settlement. With a revival of mental activity of all sorts within the Establishment, has arisen a growing conviction of the bondage which cripples and confines all free thought and action in her pale. Has heresy to be expelled? The spiritual powers of the Church are unable to do it. Have formularies to be amended and reformed? This must be done by Act of Parliament or royal proclamation. But the clergy cannot touch a line or a letter. In fact, the disabilities of Churchmen are as numerous and pitiable as the grievances of Dissenters. The Church is bound hand and foot by her union with the State.

But this subjection is the proper and constitutional condition of a State-endowed Church. The servant is responsible to the master who hires him; and the State has a right to see to it that the Church preaches the doctrines, &c., which she is paid and

patronised for preaching. There are two sides to every bargain, and he who finds the money has a right to look for a *quid pro quo* for his cash. As long as the State pays the Church, the State has a right to satisfy itself that the Church fulfils her side of the contract. If the Church will go down to Egypt for bread, she must not be surprised if she finds herself in the house of bondage. The Puseyite notion of separation of Church and State, which would leave the Church in the possession of all her State endowments and revenues, but without any responsibility to the State for their right appropriation, is absurd and unconstitutional. The Church can purchase freedom at any time on one condition, and that is, the abandonment of all claim on national property for her support:—on this condition, and *no other*. We trust Dissenters, and especially our Baptist friends, will watch this question warmly, and not be induced to aid *High Churchmen* in claiming for the "Church" such a power of self-government as *they* desire to obtain for her. It would be dangerous to British liberties, and altogether opposed to the honour of our constitutional law, whether written or prescriptive, to allow a huge corporation to have the uncontrolled appropriation of such immense national revenues. The nation, by its Parliament, must have the control of all national property, and the control of that property clearly involves a right to see that it is employed for the purposes intended; and this again in the case of an Established Church involves a right to see that the Church continues to hold and preach the doctrines which the State has ordained.

In the pamphlet before us, the recent efforts of Convocation to assert a measure of ecclesiastical authority are exposed, and some important information on other kindred topics is given. We commend the following figures to the attention of our readers —"In round numbers, the Episcopal Church in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland comprises about 10,760,000; Presbyterians and Protestant Nonconformists 12,300,000, and Catholics 5,700,000." (P. 26.) In view of these figures, what becomes of the boasted *nationality* of the Church?

Memoirs of Henrietta Caracciolo, of the Princes of Forino; Ex-Benedictine Nun. From the Italian. London: R. Bentley. 1864.

THESE memoirs are written by the ex-nun herself. She is now married and happy. She was living outside of convent walls before Garabaldi reached Naples, but was in danger; his arrival was her liberty. The Italian Government has decreed the suppression of convents. She has written the history of her convent-life, to prove by facts how just is that decree. She shows that those who NOW live a monastic life, are not only USELESS to society, but BANEFUL to it. Many who live in these "INACCESSIBLE PRISONS," are victims of the selfishness of parents and others who BURY them there in spite of their detestation of such a life. The Benedictine nuns are spoken of as "the most illustrious of all the orders." Yet she says that in spite of the reforms of the Council of Trent, "the MORALS of the age of the BORGIAS," and "the BRUTALISED IGNORANCE and SUPERSTITIONS" of those who took delight in the *auto-da-fé*, exist in convents still;—that evil passions, compressed and condensed within these narrow bounds, sometimes burst out with more terrific force than in the world outside;—that convents have all the vices, without the advantages, of cities;—that the number of exemplary nuns is so small that "it is lost sight of in the immense majority of the evil-doers." The convent vow of obedience to superiors, gives to priest, bishop, and cardinal, an absolute and despotic control. The confessional is the means by which the priest cultivates society with the "brides of Christ;" and if they, instead of loving, give offence, by coldness or resentment, to those who represent "the heavenly spouse," there is no escape from anger terrible as death. The ex-nun, while suffering from the anger of a cardinal, endured agony which took away in part her reason; drove her to desperation; made

Intelligence.

SAXONY.

My beloved Brother Parker,—According to the desire of our esteemed secretary, Mr. Woollacott, I this time send my report to you. I am glad to have in this respect to deal with you, a man who, like Mr. W., can have compassion with my infirmities in the English language.

In the beginning of October last, when I sent in my last report, the quarterly conference of our church in the provinces of Saxony took place in Halle. On Saturday evening, the 8th October, a number of brethren from the various stations arrived at my head-quarters, with whom we spent a happy evening in prayer, singing, and mutual intercourse. On Lord's Day morning, the members from the next neighbourhood arrived, with those out of the town, when we commenced with a prayer meeting, imploring the Lord's presence and blessing. Soon after this, at half-past nine o'clock, the first service commenced. I, indeed, could feel and see how all, with me, expected some special blessing for this day, and the Lord graciously, not only gratified, but even exceeded our expectations; although the subject for our consideration did not seem to me at first to be adapted for this day, whilst, however, I felt it was the Lord's will to be preached; already by the introductory reading and expounding of the third chapter of Malachi, we felt the Lord's presence, and all enjoyed his special blessing when a much-neglected duty and, alas, often disliked subject, was dwelt upon, which is—"Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him." I spoke, with the Lord's help, 1st, on the right manner of giving, considering the text more verbally; and, 2nd, on the motives to liberality—the command of God—the fact that we are His debtors—the necessity of liberality, and the blessing of it. The sermon was blessed, and not without practical results.* In the afternoon a church meeting took place, in which several affairs were ordered, and we also had the joy to receive two candidates for baptism. The first was a colporteur of the Lutheran State Church, who had by becoming a Baptist to sacrifice his situation, to suffer the loss of many friends, and to bear the enmity of his wife, who had been engaged against him by the clergy; still, he trusted in the Lord, and could not do otherwise but follow him in all his footsteps. The other person was a widow, who some time since had sought salvation without finding it, till she was in our meetings directed to the right and only source of it—Jesus Christ. She was very happy, and joyfully confessed how great things the Lord had done to her and had compassion on her. Both were unanimously received. Some time after the evening service we went out of the town to the river Saale, accompanied by a great number of people desirous to witness the "strange sight." When all was ready on the banks of the river, we sung a hymn, after which I spoke on the Scriptural ordinance of believers' immersion, and of infant sprinkling as properly the "*strange sight*." When I had, as usual, because of the crowd, once more asked the candidates if they believed with all their heart that the despised and crucified Nazarene, Jesus Christ, is the true God himself, and their Saviour, to which they replied aloud in the affirmative, we went into the river to bury them in their Lord's death. Singing,

"With Jesus let us go," &c.,

we went home again, and celebrated the Lord's death in our meeting room.

At this conference I made engagements to preach in various places, and first went, soon after it, to Lützen, the town famous through Gustav Adolph, King of Sweden, who fell there on the 6th November, 1632, in

* I might mention that these collections go to the Mission Society in Hamburg, which uses them partly for the General German Mission, and partly remits them to the Heathen Mission.

the war for the protection of the Protestants. The saloon of the shooting-house, which we had hired, was nearly filled with various hearers, to whom I explained the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ. The Lord grant that they may believe it, and thus experience its saving power. The day following I was expected in Spergan, where the people gathered at the appointed hour in a dancing-place of the lowest kind. If you had looked into that place, you might have been frightened. You would have seen me on the orchestra; to my left hand, a big drum and other instruments; to my right hand, large pictures of drunkards, and bottles and glasses; further on, on the walls, there were painted devils and hell-dogs. But, at the same time, you would have wondered when you heard, now, this temple of Satan, ring with the sound of the gospel of Christ, and the singing of the people—

"Now praise ye all the Lord,
With hearts, and mouth, and hands," &c.

At the end of the month I made a tour to our brethren of the church in the kingdom of Saxony. By letters, we had agreed to meet on a certain spot of a small forest near Oederan. When I arrived there, having many miles to walk in a heavy storm and rain, our members were just coming with three applicants for fellowship; but, because of the rain and the cold wind, we were constrained to look out for some shelter, which we found in an inn, where we took a room to ourselves. Here we held, after some mutual conversation, a prayer meeting and a Bible class; next to it followed a church meeting, in which the three applicants were heard and examined. Their confessions were gratifying, and the testimonies concerning their conversation in their favour; so they were unanimously received. At last the night broke in, and we left the inn to go to a pool, about five miles distant, where, then, we joined in singing a hymn and in asking a blessing upon the candidates, after which the ordinance was administered. The night was rather dark, cold, and wet; but we could praise the Lord even for that, because it kept us sure, and our enemies, the policemen, afar. During that same night, having parted with our brethren, I went to the next village, where I found a poor lodging for that night. On the next morning I had the opportunity to speak of Christ and his salvation to a number of persons, and then hastened away to escape my countrymen. And it was good I escaped, for the police soon had heard of what had taken place. In a letter I got a few days after from our brethren in Oederan, I was informed that two policemen had come on the following Sabbath in their meeting and driven them from each other, searched their house like a house of thieves, took away all their Bibles, Testaments, tracts, and other religious publications. Our brethren, however, rejoice in all these persecutions for Christ's sake; but, at the same time, they pray and groan for religious liberty; but, above all, we desire more than liberty for ourselves—liberty for the gospel, that it may have free course and be glorified; and, in order that it may be glorified, even the words of the apostle seem to imply that it must have, first of all, free course; but at present the preaching of it in Saxony proper is still prohibited to Dissenters by imprisonment for three years.

I might mention that one of the above converts, a miner, had been brought to a knowledge of his sins and the Saviour, by a tract I several years ago translated from the English, its title being "Golden Things." His house, too, has been visited and searched by the police, and cleared by them from all religious literature.

November.—Having returned from Oederan, I conducted the regular meetings in Halle, taught the school, served at the Lord's table, and then set out for another quarter. First I preached Christ, and him crucified, in Glaucha, where the dancing-hall was hired for the purpose. The day following I went to Hohenpriessnitz, a large village, where, in a like place, I proclaimed the "Prophet like Moses." The people listened attentively. May they learn to follow Him, of whom not only Moses, but also the Father, said, "Him shall ye

hear!" Travelling further, I came to Cossa, where we likewise had hired the spacious ball-room, in which I had then another opportunity to point hundreds to "Jesus, the only and greatly needed Saviour." Several expressed, after the meeting, their joy and gratitude, requesting me to come soon again.

On my return to Halle, I preached on the "Temptation of Christ," and the Sabbath following, in the forenoon, on the "Transfiguration of Christ," and in the evening of "Christ as the only sure Foundation." A week after, I went in the neighbourhood of Cönnern, where I had the opportunity in various places to testify to the gospel of the grace of God. In L., for instance, a large number assembled in a dancing-hall, it being the day after their so-called "Sunday of the Dead," that is the Sabbath which the Lutherans devote to the dead, especially always to those who died during the last year, and by which tradition of men they not only brake the Sabbath in building and adorning the tombs in the churchyard, but also erroneously pray for the dead, which is an inheritance from their mother, the Roman Catholic Church. I took advantage of it, and preached death and judgment, showing them, according to Heb. ix. 27, that, 1st, *death* is the appointment of God, happening but once—the consequence of sin—universal—fearful to the unconverted—and gain to the believer; and that, 2nd, the *judgment* is—an immediate one—unavoidable—a just—and a serious one.

To be short now. During the last quarter, enjoying health and grace from above, I preached forty-three sermons, held prayer meetings and Bible classes, taught regularly the Sabbath school, officiated as pastor of two churches, and accomplished several literary labours. The following tracts I wrote since the last report:—

1. The Most Fatal Error; or, The Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.
2. The Creation; showing that Science and Geology do not Contradict, but Confirm, the Sayings of the Bible.
3. Too Late! Too Late! Too Late!
4. On Christian Liberality.
5. The Deathbed of the Infidel and of the Believer.
6. What think ye of Christ? &c.

May now all these feeble efforts be laid at the feet of Christ and crowned with his blessing—that is our hearty desire. And excuse me, beloved, if on this occasion I attempt to become the beggar, viz.—since many of our tracts on the Continent, which have proved so very useful, are, in fact, translations from the English, I would beg our dear brethren who read this, if any one has a copy of any or several good tracts to spare, to send them to me, that they may be translated, and bring forth fruit, even from the German soil. Thus, "Cast your bread upon the waters (let it come across the German ocean), and you shall find it after many days."

But, above all, dear brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified, even as it is with you!

With my heartfelt love to you and all, ever believe me,

Yours truly,

MORITZ GEISSLER.

Halle, 16th December, 1864.

DRAKE-STREET, ROCHDALE.

OPENING OF THE NEW SCHOOL.

THE inaugural services in connection with the opening of these new and commodious school-rooms have just been held. For many years the children belonging to the Sabbath school in connection with the Baptist Church in Drake-street, have met in the chapel, but when, a short time since, the galleries were added to the building to meet the demand for increased accommodation, it was felt that it was impossible to conduct the school in an efficient manner, and various suggestions were made with a view to meet the difficulty. The most feasible of these was to shorten the chapel a little by making four class-rooms, but there was a serious objection raised to this, viz.—that the increasing congregation would soon necessitate the alteration of the chapel to its original form. The matter was submitted to H. Kelsall, Esq., for his opinion, and with a characteristic munificence that gentle-

man said—"By no means spoil the beauty of the chapel by destroying its proportion. I will build you a school-room, which will meet all the difficulties of the case." Such a noble offer was, of course, readily accepted, and Mr. Kelsall at once gave directions for the commencement of the work, which has just been so auspiciously completed.

No cost has been spared in adapting the edifice to the purposes for which it is required. It is built in the same style as the chapel, and consists of a large room for the ragged school children, who are so generously cared for by Mrs. Kemp; two class-rooms; two capital cellar kitchens, fitted with every convenience, and a hoist connecting them with the rooms above; a large school-room capable of holding 500 or 600 people; and a chapel-keeper's house. The whole of the outlay has been between £1,100 and £1,200.

On the Sunday, two sermons were preached by the Rev. A. Pitt, the esteemed pastor of the church, on the following subjects—in the morning, "The lambs of Jesus, and how to feed them;" and in the evening, "Aaron's breastplate, or believers dear to Christ." Collections were made at the close to meet the expense of furnishing the school-rooms. The congregations were good, and deep interest was evinced in the services, and the special claims they were intended to enforce. In the afternoon of the same day H. Kelsall, Esq., gave the children and teachers of the school, together with the parents, an address of a highly practical and interesting nature.

On the Tuesday, a public tea was held in the large school-room, the trays being gratuitously provided by the ladies of the congregation. There was a very numerous company, the spacious room, which was beautifully decorated, being filled in every part. An interesting meeting was held afterwards, over which G. T. Kemp, Esq., presided. At this meeting an address from the church and Sabbath school, signed by the pastor and deacons, was presented to Mr. Kelsall. Appropriate and interesting addresses were given by the chairman, the Revs. S. Sugden, A. Pitt, E. C. Pike, B.A., and other friends.

ONSTON.

OPENING OF A NEW BAPTIST CHAPEL.

THE opening services of this chapel took place on Sunday, January 8th. In the forenoon a devotional service was held, and an earnest address was delivered by Mr. John Swinton. In the afternoon W. Ross, Esq., of Liverpool, preached to a crowded audience on the "Preëminence of Christ." In the evening the Rev. J. Harvey, of Little Leigh, preached to a deeply interested congregation. On the afternoon and evening of Monday, the Rev. H. S. Brown, of Liverpool, preached two able and eloquent sermons to very large congregations. The friends concerned in the erection of this chapel, feeling greatly encouraged by the results of their efforts, held a thanksgiving meeting on Thursday evening, when expressions of gratitude were given to God and man for enabling the committee to close their interesting opening services free from debt, and they expressed their thanks to kind friends near and at a distance. The entire cost of the building, land, deeds, &c., is £240, and for that sum a neat, commodious country chapel has been erected, capable of accommodating 200 persons, and which can, for the present, be divided to provide for a Sunday school. At the last named service the following ministers were engaged: Messrs. Smith and Harvey, of Little Leigh; Wilkinson, Latchford; Wycherley, Malpas; Nuttall, Ogden, and Walters, of Rawden College.

FORMATION OF A NEW CHURCH.

ON Thursday, December 29th, 1864, a number of friends who formerly worshipped at Salendine Nook, near Huddersfield, were formed into an orderly Baptist Church at Quarmby, near Huddersfield. In the morning the service commenced at 10 30, when the Rev. J. Barker, of Lockwood, conducted the devotional exercises; the Rev. John Hanson, of Huddersfield, described the nature and constitution of a Christian church; after which the brethren and sisters, thirty-six in number, were formed into a Christian church. The Rev. H. Watts, of Golcar, offered special prayer for the church.